

REMARKS

Claims 26, 33-35, and 41-44 remain in the application after the foregoing amendments. Claims 26, 41, and 43 have been amended and claims 22-25 and 36-40 have been canceled.

In the final Office Action mailed January 24, 2011, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 22-23, 25, 36-38, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over previously cited Wiss in view of previously cited Alcock and Petre et al. Claims 24 and 39 were rejected as obvious over Wiss in view of Alcock and Petre and further in view of previously cited Richards et al. Claims 26 and 33-35 were allowed and claims 41-44 were found to be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Acceptance of Allowed Claims

Applicant has canceled rejected claims 22-25 and 36-40. Allowed claim 26 has been amended to correct informalities therein. More particularly, the recitation of “a QPSK modulation circuit based on a complex scrambling code” was eliminated because no such circuit was found in the description or drawings. A recitation of “a first circuit” was amended to eliminate at the end thereof “to the second circuit” for lack of antecedent basis of the “second circuit”. The recitation regarding the “integration circuit” was also amended for clarity, *i.e.*, to indicate that the integration circuit “is structured to integrate the output of the divider.” No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 and corresponding dependent claims 33-35 should remain allowed.

Dependent claim 41 was rewritten to incorporate the limitations of allowable dependent claim 37 and corresponding independent claim 36. However, the recitation of “a QPSK modulation circuit structured for a complex searching code” at the beginning of claim 36 was eliminated because no such circuit was described in the specification or found in the drawings. In view of the amendment to dependent claim 41 to write it into independent form, applicant respectfully submits that claim 41 is allowable as are corresponding dependent claims

Application No. 10/536,641
Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2011

42-44. Allowable dependent claim 43 was amended to provide antecedent basis for “the divider” by inserting “circuit” after “divider” and reciting inputs structured to receive the output of both low pass filters. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in this application are now in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing all of the claims and passing the case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/
E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jl
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1829118_1.DOC